DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 258 187 CS 208 890

AUTHOR Luka, Leslie Richard
TITLE The Conceptualization of Literature Instruction by Nine High-School English Teachers.
PUB DATE [82]
NOTE 27p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Cognitive Development; Cognitive Processes; Concept Formation; *English Instruction; High Schools; High School Students; *Literature Appreciation; *Secondary School Teachers
IDENTIFIERS *English Teachers; *Instructional Preparation

ABSTRACT

The combined methods of observation and interview were used in a study examining how English teachers conceptualize instruction in literature. Nine high school English teachers from two midwest, suburban high schools served as the subjects. In the first two meetings, the teachers were informed that two people would be observing and taping one of their class periods, during which all teachers would teach the same short story. Interviews with the teachers were conducted after the tapings. Classroom observations and teacher interviews were analyzed in order to provide descriptions of the nature and components of preinstructional deliberation by high school English teachers. The information collected throughout the study supports the conclusion that the teachers participating in this study perceived learning to result from contact with or exposure to the item to be learned; that is, teachers viewed learning as a presentation of details to be recalled by the students. Consequently, their classroom activities did not reflect a pattern or progression of skills in any type of hierarchical and sequential order. Results suggest that instead of being a prime source for developing thinking skills among students, inquiry into literature at the high school level may be impeding higher level cognitive development. (DF)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED258187

THE CONCEPTUALIZATION OF LITERATURE INSTRUCTION BY NINE HIGH-SCHOOL ENGLISH TEACHERS

Leslie Richard Luka

5921 West 103rd Street
Oak Lawn, Illinois 60453

English Department Chairperson
Oak Lawn Community High School

Home Phone: (312) 422-7257

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Leslie R. Luka

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS208890

Until recently, classroom observations have been bound to various conceptual schemes whose aim was instructional improvement through the use of a particular method or material. These studies examined the teacher's role in one of two ways. In the first, researchers conducted observations to describe classroom activities such as lecture, small group discussion, question-and-answer, and programmed or individualized instruction along with their relative frequency according to subject area, teacher, and student type. (Barr and Dreeben, 1976) Some of these studies went beyond categorization to measure student achievement and/or affective response in relation to teacher personalities, preparation, and experience and the type of activity (Flanders, 1965) .

In the second major category, researchers attempted to measure the success of particular theoretical models of instruction applied in the classroom. In these studies, the teacher's role was to implement a specific mode or method of instruction. The researcher/observer determined this mode or method; the teacher was expected to follow it as precisely as possible to ensure validity and reliability. (Carroll, 1963; Bennett, 1966; Jackson, 1968; Adams and Biddle, 1970; Bloom, 1974, 1981; Kounin, 1970; Dahllof, 1971.)

In neither category does the researcher focus on the teacher's conceptualization of planning or instruction. In the first, the researchers focused exclusively on the classroom operation; in the second, the researcher provided the planning. Thus, while the research has examined what teachers do in the classroom and how successful they are, until recently (Marx and Peterson, 1981), it has not gone beyond the classroom observations to discover the teacher's own conceptualization of the knowledge with which he/she is working nor of the learning processes involved in imparting that knowledge to students.

It is from this latter perspective that classroom observations become the source for questions rather than the resolution of them. For example, why did the teacher begin the study of a novel or short story or selection with the question he/she did? Why did the teacher continue the use of questioning to study the story or selection? Why did the teacher move from one particular activity to another? Why was the move done in precisely that way? Why did the teacher structure the study of this story or selection in this way? What was the role of the teacher's previous experience in determing the activities and procedures? How did the teacher view the content or material in coming to these decisions? Finally, how did the teacher view students' success (or lack of success) with the story in relation to the classroom activities designed by the teacher?

This study was conducted to provide a means of answering such questions in relation to English teachers' conceptualizations of their usual practices in teaching literature and the observed effects of these conceptualizations on classroom activities and student response. By analyzing both what teachers do in their classrooms when they teach a story and what they say about what they have done in teaching the story, the study was able to examine how English teachers conceptualize instruction in literature. While others (Purves, 1967, 1968) have identified the goals and purposes for the study of literature, they have not examined the process of instruction in terms of how teachers view learning to take place.

Instruments

The study required two types of instruments.

For the observation and analysis of classroom activities, the first category of instruments included four items. Rosenshine and Furst's, The Use of Direct

Observation to Study Teachers (1973), provided a schema of items to be considered for measurement; among them, teacher versus student talk time, the number of questions asked by the teacher, the number of students responding to the questions, and the frequency with which the same students were called upon.

The study used a second item, a system of episodic delineation developed by Hillocks in order to provide organization to these observations. According to this method, the activities of the classroom were organized according to a structure of "epsiodes." For the purpose of this study, an "episode' was defined as a set of interactions between teacher and students that is characterized by a particular activity, piece of material, or focus of interest.

An "episode" characterized by a particular activity would be one involving a change from whole class discussion to a writing assignment; or from a reading activity to a writing or speaking one; or from large group to small group discussion. In essence, this designation depends upon what the teacher and students are actually doing.

In order for an "episode" to be differentiated by the use of materials, it would be necessary for the teacher to incorporate the study and/or discussion of a film, another story, a song, or another type of writing within the study of this story. For example, in the discussion of the verbal irony and the ironies of situation found in the story, "The Interlopers," had the teacher, in order to show the students more examples, moved from those discussions to a poem which also included these ironies, there would have been a new "episode" designated.

Finally, an "episode" can be determined by its focus of interest. In the examination of literature, a number of levels to a story can be studied: the basic elements (plot, conflict, characterization, setting); an analysis of ironies (verbal and situational) in the story; the theme or author's generalization; and

the structural generalization (how the parts fit together to produce an effect). (Booth, 1982) Moving from one of those levels to another constitutes a change of "episode" as would moving from one dimension of a level to another dimension of the same level (as in moving from a discussion of conflicts to one on setting at the basic level of story discussion). Presented below is an example of a classroom teacher moving from one such "episode" to another. The part above the dotted line is an "epsiode" dealing with irony in the story, "The Interlopers." Below the line, the teacher begins a discussion of theme. (Each dot in parenthesis represents a pause of one second beyond an initial three second pause.)

Teacher: Any other examples (of irony)? (.....) Yes, Tom?

Tom: I don't know if this fits but what about that they're calling for help and instead the wolves come?

Teacher: How is that ironic?

Tom: Well, the wolves are the direct opposite of being a help (....)

Teacher: So?

Tom: Well, if they weren't yelling and making noise, maybe the wolves wouldn't have bothered them?

Teacher: All right, so the calling for help brings the opposite. (..) Fatal danger. Anything else? (.....) No?

--- -

All right, how about theme? What's the author trying to say in the story? (.....) Think of what happens. Barb?

Such a classification of activities provided for increased efficiency and insight at a number of levels. First, it provided a means of classifying the various activities of the classroom. Second, it facilitated the classification of observed activities according to taxonomic level (described below). Third, it provided an organized set of data to be used in the interviews with the teachers and allowed for a sampling of activities. This permitted a detailed exploration of the

teacher's deliberation according to activity types while not being unwieldly and excessively time-consuming by trying to cover every individual act observed in the classroom.

The third and fourth items were more refined instruments for analysis of the classroom activities. They were Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives (1956) and Hillocks and Ludlow's "A Taxonomy of Skills in Reading and Interpreting Fiction." (1982)

Each "episode" was first classified according to Bloom's Taxonomy which provides six areas in the cognitive domain. Each category is assumed to include behavior more complex, abstract, or internalized than the previous category. The initial level, labelled Knowledge, deals with bringing to mind specifics, methods, patterns, structures, or setting. For example, Jerry A. in his class asked the question, "What's the definition of interloper?" to which Judy answered, "...someone who intrudes..." That interchange was identified as being at the Knowledge level since all it required was the recall of a specific fact. Similarly, when Marge L. asked a student to name one of the characters and he eventually replied. "Ulrich von Gradwitz," simple recall of fact -- in this case a name -- was required.

Bloom's second level is Comprehension which is described as the lowest level of understanding. Involved at this level is the student's ability to summarize, paraphrase or interpret facts as opposed to just recalling them. Thus, when Rosemary B. asked, "What was the feud all about?" and accepted Chuck's answer of "The land bordering the place." instead of the story's "... the narrow strip of precipitous woodland..." the level can be categorized as Comprehension.

The third level of this cognitive taxonomy is labelled Application and

refers to the use of abstractions (such as rules of procedure or methods) in particular and concrete situations. When Jim B. asked his class where there was irony in the story, he was asking them to apply the general idea of irony (when what is expected or intended contrasts with what occurs - the definition used in the class) to the events of the story and to identify the situation fitting the general idea.

Then, when he went on to ask the student who identified the irony as "... the wolves attacking them," the question, "How is that ironic?" Jim B. was at the fourth or Analysis level of Bloom's Taxonomy. For in Analysis, the intent is to clarify the basis for and arrangement of a communication. Here, Jim B. was looking for the student to supply the connection between the events of the story and the concept of irony.

The fifth level is identified as Synthesis which involves putting together, arranging, and combining pieces in such a way as to have a structure or pattern not clearly there before. The production of a story by a student that contained irony would amount to Synthesis.

The final level of Bloom's Taxonomy is labelled Evaluation and represents statements of judgment about the value of materials and methods for a given purpose. How well the author used setting could be considered here.

While Bloom's Taxonomy provided one means of analyzing and classifying the "episodes" of the classes, the recent development of the Hillocks/Ludlow "Taxonomy" supplied specific categories related to the study of literature.

Hillocks and Ludlow's "Taxonomy" provides for seven levels or categories of statements made about a work of fiction. The first level is identified as Basic Stated Information and has the following characteristics: the information is sine qua non for the story; the conditions are stated many times; and, such

information is usually important to higher levels of meaning. Thus when Peggy H. asked, "What is it (the feud) about?" and Renee answered, "Land," Renee's answer is Basic Stated Information because this knowledge is essential to the story; it forms the basis for it; it is repeated throughout the story; and, the idea of feuding over land is essential to determining the theme of the story -- a higher level of meaning.

The second level is labelled Key Detail and is characterized as an event which occurs at an important juncture of the plot and bears some causal relationship to what happens. Thus, in this interchange from Rosemary B.'s class

Tchr.: A "deed of nature's own violence" overtook the men. What was this deed?

Laura: "... the beech tree had fallen upon them."

there is a sample of a Key Detail statement. This event is crucial to the rest of the story and comes at an important juncture of the plot. Had this not happened, one of the two men would be dead and the story ended.

The third level, Stated Relationships, involves statements directly in the text about the relationship between two pieces of information. A question at this level might ask, "Why didn't Ulrich shoot Georg immediately upon seeing him?" To which the student would need to translate the following line

> But a man who has been brought up under the code of a restraining civilization cannot easily nerve himself to shoot down his neighbor in cold blood and without a word spoken ...

Moving from the Stated Relationship to the Simple Implied Relationship level involves the use of inference from an event in the story instead of its direct statement in the text. Thus when Nancy H. asked at the end of the story, "What did that last word mean?" and Rich answered "They get killed," we have a Simple Implied Relationship. The story never says the men were killed but clearly implies that they were.

The fifth level of the Hillocks/Ludlow "Taxonomy", labelled Complex Implied Relationship, is where many pieces of information and a large number of details are involved. For example, Peggy H. provides the following explanation:

> ... remember why and how they got trapped (..) They were there because they wanted to kill each other (..) the whole set of events was set in action the moment von Gradwitz walked out his door hunting to kill Znaeym and Znaeym stepped across the boundary of von Gradwitz's property (....) At that point they put into motion a whole set of events (.....) none of which were controlled by them (..) They had no power to stop the storm (..) They couldn't stop the tree from falling (..) and they couldn't stop the wolves. The only thing they could control was their urge to kill. When they decided to move ahead, they were doomed (....) because they had voluntarily given over control of events.

Here a number of pieces of information (the actions and attitudes of the characters, the events of the story, the nature of the wolves, the forces of nature) must be put together to explain the conclusion of the story. Putting all these details together and inferring their siginificance in the story places the statement in the Complex Implied Relationship category.

The sixth level is that of Author's Generalization and deals with his view of the world outside his work. Statements and explications of the theme fit into this category in so far as they are developed into generalizable insights about the world beyond the literary work. Thus while the statement, "Feuds are foolish," may be the initial step toward developing a statement of the Author's Generalization for this story, in itself, it is too simple for acceptance as such. In this story, the Author's Generalization would need to involve all the information and supporting evidence dealing with a question such as "What does Saki suggest about humanity's relationship to the universe?"

Finally, the level of Structural Generalization focuses on how parts work together to achieve certain effects. Thus, the following question about the

author's use of verbal irony in relation to the theme is in this category:

> As they establish their friendship, Georg tells Ulrich, "...if we choose to make peace among our people, there is none other to interfere..."
>
> How does this fit into the author's view of humanity's place in the universe?

The response fits this category because it requires an understanding of irony and its use in this story to contrast humanity's limited view of its power with the actual place it has in the scheme of things. It requires that the student (or teacher) infer the significance of this statement coming at the pair's making peace and before being killed by the wolves to imply the limited perspective people have.

In addition to these instruments a second category of items was needed for the interview with each of the subjects. However, because the area of teacher pre-instructional deliberation has been virtually unexplored in general and in the field of English, no reliable or validated instrument existed. Adaptation of the questions used in the Marx and Peterson research (1981) along with ones developed specific to the nature of this project were tested in three pilot studies.

Procedure

The design used in this study was that of descriptive research. Since the purpose of this study was to obtain an initial insight into how a sample of English teachers conceptualize what they do as teachers of literature, the combined methods of observational and interview research provided the best means of attaining that goal.

Consequently, the following procedure was used:

1. Nine high-school English teachers, involved in the teaching of tenth-grade literature, from two, midwest, suburban high schools served as the subjects

of this study: five from one school and four from the other.

Five from School A were chosen from eight available who teach sophomore literature. Their inclusion was designed to provide for two criteria: one, equal representation of all ability levels as tracked by the high school: High, Average, Low; and, two, observation of changes and adaptations in classroom procedures and teacher planning according to student ability levels as exhibited in these tracks. Thus for each of the five teachers, two different ability level classes were used in the study.

The four teachers from School B comprised all the teachers involved in the teaching of sophomore literature at that school. Since all four had more than one section of the class, and since the sections were not determined by ability grouping, the classes chosen for observation were chosen by lot.

The use of these nine teachers provided the study with a sampling of years of experience, formal preparation and both sexes. Equally important, the use of teachers from two different schools addressed the concern that a similar school-wide style or approach to teaching might bias the results of the study.

Of the nine teachers, four were male and five female. The length of teaching experience ranged from three years to twenty-seven years with a group average of fourteen years. Six of the nine teachers had Master's Degrees and three had just Bachelor's. Among those with the Bachelor's Degrees were the teachers with the fewest number of years of experience and the one with the greatest number of years. Two of School A's five subjects had Master's Degrees and all four subjects from School B had Master's Degrees.

The study was limited purposely to nine teachers by reason of the time and the resources available. Because of the procedure employed in the study (described below), for each hour of classroom observation, over six hours of work were ne-

cessary by the team members involved. This work included time for setting up and taking down the taping equipment; time for preparing tapes of the classroom activities for each of the three members of the study team; time for preparing a typewritten copy for each member of the team; time for each member of the team to analyze the transcripts according to specific processes (described later in this paper); and, finally, time for all three members of the team to meet and compare analyses. Having discovered the amount of time that would be required by way of the pilot studies, it was decided that it was better to examine a small sample thoroughly from the multiple perspectives our instruments provided than to use a large sample analyzed in less depth.

2. After selection of the nine teachers, two meetings were spent with them. It was explained that two individuals would be observing and taping one or two of their literature lessons -- specifically a short story lesson -- and would be asking them about the activities that took place in the class.

Teachers were asked to name three or four of the stories they usually covered during the first semester of the school year with their sophomore classes. Among the stories listed, "The Interlopers" by Saki appeared on each list. All teachers also said that they used no more than one class period studying the story.

The study used just one story in order to make clearer comparisons among all the teachers. Using this one story (which was a part of each teacher's regular program of instruction) permitted a broader investigation of the possible components of teacher planning: adaptation to student needs and abilities. In addition, the use of only one story provided a commonality for discussion and generalization about the subjects of the study. The possibility of variation in teaching style and in views of the learning process could be more directly defined if only one story was used rather than multiple selections. For with multiple selections, the

variations in activity and in conceptualizations of instruction might result not from the teacher's view of how learning occurs but from the teacher's judgment of the difficulty level of the story or from some other source.

3. Prior to the actual observations and interviews, two other English teachers and I familiarized ourselves with defining classroom "episodes" and the categories of the Bloom and Hillocks/Ludlow taxonomies. In addition, pilot studies were conducted to build a reliable Questionnaire and for mastering the analysis process needed for this study. At the same time, a stenographer-typist and a media expert developed the proficiency needed to produce the transcripts and tapes of each observed class.

4. The schedule of observations and interviews was set to allow two days of observation for each teacher in case the lesson could not be completed in one class period. Each class was observed by two members of the team.

5. At the end of each class, three copies of the tape recordings were made and transcribed for the three team members. Within twenty-four hours, the following procedure occurred:

a. Each member of the team prepared a chart of the "episodes" and the taxonomic levels and types according to both Bloom and Hillocks/Ludlow.

b. The team met, examined the charts and compared classifications of the "episodes" and their taxonomic levels. In distinguishing episodes, the degree of agreement among the team members was 92%; in identifying the episodes according to Bloom's Taxonomy, 90.4%; according to Hillocks/Ludlow, 91.6%. Where initial agreement did not occur, additional discussion was conducted to work out the classifications together. This resulted in unanimity in all the remaining categorizations except for three. In these cases, the majority decision was the one used for the study.

6. I met with each teacher and discussed the activities and "episodes" observed in the classes using both the actual phrasing of the questions and, at times, using the questionnaire as a guide to ensure that all areas were covered. These interviews were taped; copies of the tape and transcripts of the recording were reviewed by the team members and compared to the original findings.

7. The teachers who evaluated student understanding of the story supplied copies of the instruments they used, copies of the students' work on them, and their grading of those students. The team examined the items on the test in relation to specific objectives of the teacher (as revealed through the interviews), and in relation to the taxonomic levels and the nature of the "episodes." Student success on the test was examined in a similar fashion.

Procedures for Analysis

Classroom observations and teacher interviews were analyzed in order to provide a description of the nature and components of pre-instructional deliberation by high-school English teachers.

Analysis of the information from the classroom observations included

- -- the amount of teacher talk time versus student talk time
- -- the nature and cognitive level of the episodes observed
- -- the number and kinds (cognitive levels) of questions being asked
- -- the number of students involved in answering the questions
- -- the taxonomic levels of statements being made by both the teacher and the students
- -- the means used for evaluation, their relationship to the activities of the classroom, and student success on the instruments

These items of analysis incorporated procedures of classroom observation established by others in the field -- Brophy (1979); Rosenshine and Furst (1973) -- in addition to providing a methodology for characterizing the taxonomic levels of communication and interchanges occurring in the classes. These areas, proceeding from the considerations of classroom research, provided a range of investigation and categorization that produced a clear understanding of what was

occurring in the teaching of literature and that structured the observed activities into a usable and convenient reference for interviewing the teachers.

Analysis of the interviews focused on each teacher's views of the classroom learning activities:

-- the purpose for the story, its usefulness and difficulty
-- the reasons for particular methods or activities observed and how the teacher came to use them
-- the influence of previous teaching experience with the story
-- the teacher's conceptualization of student abilities and class composition in determining the use of the observed activities
-- the role of student behavior in determining the direction of the class
-- the reason for the evaluation instrument used and the estimation of student success on it

The subjects' comments in these categories were compared to specific items of the first analytic set. This produced insights into the nature and components of deliberative planning and the conceptualization of instruction.

Findings

The study produced findings in two areas: one from the observations of the various classroom activities used in the study of the story, "The Interlopers"; the second from the teachers' interviews about the activities used in their classroom study. Since the two areas were so interrelated, the two sets of findings will be presented together where appropriate.

1) Classroom activities fell into three major categories: small group discussion, reading the story aloud, and question-and-answer approaches. In addition, another method -- termed "modified lecture" in which the teacher expanded upon a particular literary point (irony, theme), event of the story, or point of general knowledge -- was found to be used by all teachers.

Teachers in their interviews revealed that they used the method or methods so that students would enjoy the story more or better; so that students would understand the literary elements of irony and theme more clearly; and, so that students

would participate more in the activities and, consequently, learn better. These last two reasons (better learning and more participation) were expressed most frequently by teachers in discussing the question-and-answer method and the "modified lecture" method.

2) In this regard, the second area of analysis concentrated on the use of questioning as a method and with it, the amount of student participation as measured by the numbers of students involved and the amount of classroom time used by the students in giving answers and in discussing the story.

The analysis of the number of questions being asked revealed an average of 22 questions for School A with a range of 8 to 37 and an average of 26 for School B with a range of 5 to 38 questions. In School A, where classes were tracked by ability, there was no significant difference (on a test of t) at the .05 level between the numbers of questions at any two levels. However, the high ability classes did show the highest average number with 26 questions being asked; the low ability level was next with 24, and the average ability level was third with 19 questions as an average.

In their interviews, the teachers said they asked the number of questions they did to insure that the students understood all that the story had to offer (the plot, conflicts, character traits, setting, irony, theme) and to make sure the majority of students were involved. To determine the extent of student involvement, another analysis addressed the number of students called on to participate and how much of the class time they used in this participation. Table 1 describes the number and percent of students involved in each class.

The range of participation, as found in Table 1, went from 10.7% in one class to 66.7% in the highest. The average participation, however, was 34.7%. When this was adjusted to take into account those classes who had the story read to them (since they would not have as much time for participation), the average

rose to 43.8% -- still fewer than half the students participating; even though the number of questions asked in each class exceeded the number of students present to answer them. In School A where tracking occurs, the high ability level averaged 48.8% of the students participating; the low ability track had 33.2%; and the average ability track had 27.3%.

TABLE 1

STUDENTS CALLED ON IN CLASS

Teacher - Class	Total Number of Students	Number Involved	Percent Involved
Jerry A. - Average	27	8	29.6
- Low	20	9	45.0
Marge L. - High	26	9	34.6
- Low	22	7	31.8
John L. - High	24	16	66.7
- Average	26	9	34.6
Pam B. - Average	28	4	14.2
- Low	22	5	22.7
Peggy H. - High	20	9	45.0
- Average	26	8	30.8
Jim B.	28	3	10.7
Al C.	26	7	26.9
Nancy H.	23	8	34.8
Rosemary B.	28	18	64.3
TOTAL: Both Schools	346	120	34.7 (adjusted 43.8)

Note: The adjusted TOTAL percentage figure (43.8) was obtained by considering only those classes where the teacher had not read the story aloud in class, since the reading would necessarily have limited the time for questions.

The second part of this investigation examined the amount of time spent by students making statements or involved in the discussion of the story. Table 2 presents the break-down of time used by students and by teachers. The average percent of Student Talk Time at School A was 17% while at School B it was 9%. For both schools this percentage ranged from 2% of the time in one class to 35% in the highest. At School A, the high ability classes showed the highest percentage of time used by the students with an average of 29.6%; the low ability classes showed the least with 11.9%. The average ability classes averaged 13.8%. All these percentages are based on "Total Talk Time," not the entire class time available. When examined according to the latter, the percentage of time spent by students in dialogue or conversation never exceeds 13% of any class.

3) A third form of analysis was concerned with the number of episodes evident in the classes. On examination it was found that the number of episodes resulted from a change in the focus of attention -- that is, moving from considering one facet (like irony) to another (like theme). The analysis revealed that there were an average 5.8 episodes -- or changes in focus -- in the classes which could be adjusted to 4.5 episodes when the last episode of the class (one usually involved with an activity not connected to the story) was removed from consideration. In the interviews, the teachers explained that they perceived the story as a simple one which did not lend itself to extensive study. Consequently, there were few changes in focus.

4) Use of the Bloom and the Hillocks/Ludlow taxonomies provide a means of examining the actual cognitive levels of the lesson episodes.

Table 3 presents the findings with the Bloom Taxonomy. Table 3 indicates that the predominant level of operation in the classrooms was at the analysis level. In examining the totals for each school, it can be seen that all the other levels together are fewer than the category of analysis by itself. At

TABLE 2

TIME DISTRIBUTION

Teacher/Class	Teacher Talk-Time In Minutes	Student Talk-Time In Minutes	Student Percent of Talk-Time	Writing Time	Reading Time
@Jerry A. - Avg.	11	25*	--	5	--
- Low	18	8	31	14	
@Marge L. - High	17	9	34	15	
	2	1	33		
- Low	35 (31)	2	5		
@John L. - High	18	8	31		14
- Avg.	11	6	35	21	
@Pam B. - Avg.	39 (35)	1½	3		
- Low	38 (34)	1½	4		
@Peggy H. - High	20	6	23		
- Avg.	2	0	00	----40--------	
	6	2	25		
#Jim B.	42 (37)	1	2		3
#Al C.	45 (33)	1½	3		
#Nancy H. (30 min)	24 (13)	3	11		
	25 (20)	1¼	5	20	
#Rosemary B.	23	7	30	------17-------	

@ These classes are 45 minutes in length.

These classes are 50 minutes in length.

* This includes both question/answer time and small group discussion time.

(00) This indicates the amount of time reading the story aloud.

00
00 This indicates two days were spent discussing the story and the time spent each day

Note: Not all of the time is represented by the figures since delays in class, teacher preparation, or matters not related to the class are not figured in.

TABLE 3

COGNITIVE LEVELS OF EPISODES
ACCORDING TO BLOOM'S TAXONOMY

Teacher/ Class	Number of Episodes Characterized as						
	Know-ledge	Compre-hension	Appli-cation	Analysis	Syn-thesis	Evalu-ation	Affective Response
Jerry A.							
- Avg.	3	-	4	1	-	-	-
- Low	4	-	-	4	-	-	-
Marge L.							
- High	4	-	2	5	-	-	-
- Low	3	-	2	1	-	-	-
John L.							
- High	-	2	-	8	-	-	-
- Avg.	2	-	-	3	-	-	-
Pam B.							
- Avg.	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
- Low	-	-	-	1	-	-	2
Peggy H.							
- High	2	-	-	4	-	-	-
- Avg.	3	-	-	5	-	-	-
School A	21	2	8	32	-	-	4
Jim B	-	-	-	2	-	-	-
Al C.	-	-	3	9	-	-	-
Nancy H.	1	3	-	2	-	-	1
Rosemary B.	3	4	-	3	-	-	-
School B	4	7	3	16	-	-	1

first, this did not fit with what the teachers had said previously about the story's simplicity. Further analysis of the interviews, however, reveals that the teachers did not distinguish among the processes and levels of difficulty involved in the analysis activities and those of recall and recognition. Throughout the interviews, the teachers frequently interchanged the terms of "analysis" and "recall or locate." Similarly, none of the teachers made any reference to considering or planning for different levels of activities.

Table 4 presents the findings with the Hillocks/Ludlow "Taxonomy." The data reveal that the dialogues on this story were predominantly at the literal level (represented by the first four columns). Since the predominant method of instruction employed by the teachers was question-and-answer, it appears that the level was determined by the teachers in asking questions and that the statements made by the students were in response to these questions which sought literal, factual information.

Similarly, examination of Columns Four and Five dealing with statements specifically about the story reveals the overwhelming number of statements (77 of 89) made by the students were at the Simple Implied Relationship level or lower. Question-and-answer provided a structure for study that required no more than locating specific information or supplying definitions. This is further supported by examining the column of inferential and higher level processes (Column Five). Nowhere among these categories did the students make more statements than the teachers.

By tracing both the episodes categorized by Bloom's Taxonomy and the numbers represented in Column Five to the actual statements, it was possible to discover the interplay between the various levels. Those statements at higher inferential levels were made most often by teachers without relationship

TABLE 4

COGNITIVE LEVELS OF STATEMENTS
ACCORDING TO HILLOCKS/LUDLOW

Tchr./Class	Opinion		Literary Terms		Explication		SIR and Below*		CIR and Above*	
	Tch.	St.	Tch.	St.	Tch.	St.	Tch.	St.	Tch.	St.
Jerry A. - Avg.	2	1	2	0	2	0	1	5	3	1
- Low	2	2	1	1	6	7	2	9(2)	0	0
Marge L. - High	1	0	0	1	2	2	2	15	2	0
- Low	0	2	2	0	3	2	0	1	0	0
John L. - High	0	2	1	7	3	2	4	10	6	2 (2)
- Avg.	1	1	4	5	1	1	2	7(2)	0	0
Pam B - Avg.	2	3	1	0	3	2	0	0	0	0
- Low	3	2	1	(1)	3	2	0	2	0	0
Peggy H. - High	2	3	2	0	10	5	0	2	5	2
- Avg.	2	3	0	0	0	5	0	2	0	2
School A Total	15	19	14	14	33	28	11	53	16	7
Jim B. ----	2	1	2	1	3	2	4	1	0	0
Al C. ----	1	0	1	0	5	6	0	1	3	3
Nancy H. ----	5	4 (1)	0	0	19	12	2	4	1	1
Rosemary B.----	5	7	2	1	5	3	4	18 (1)	1	1
School B Total	13	12	5	2	32	23	10	24	5	5
Both School Total	28	31	19	16	65	51	21	77	21	12

* SIR Column includes statements of Basic Stated Information, Key Detail, Stated Relationship, and Simple Implied Relationship.

* CIR Column includes statements of Complex Implied Relationship, Author's Generalization, and Structural Generalization.

Note: Numbers within parenthesis indicate additional answers for the category which were judged incorrect by the teacher.

to the previous lower level statements. Rather, the teacher expanded upon a student's answer to a lower level question, paused, and then drew attention to the new point being made. In those cases where the students made the higher level statement, it was the result of the teacher's asking a specific question seeking out the information and the higher level answer was always considerably shorter than the teacher's high level statement.

5) The methods of evaluation used by the subjects showed that the teachers kept the same taxonomic level for their questions (recall) as their in-class activities. That is, these instruments required students to recall information already presented in class. On the various instruments, over 40% of the students performed unsatisfactorily, receiving a D or F grade from the teacher. Teachers in their interviews explained this level of failure as the result of student inattention or refusal to complete the assignment.

6) Preparation for teaching the story by the subjects was characterized by the following: fewer than thirty minutes were spent in preparation; although read and studied a number of times before, the story was read as part of their preparation by all the subjects; in this regard, the reading of the story consumed the majority of the subjects' time of preparation; decisions about instructional objectives and activities were made from remembrance of prior classroom experiences.

Conclusions

1) The information collected from the analyses of the classroom activities, the teacher interviews, and the evaluation instruments supports the conclusion that the teachers of this study perceived learning to result from contact with or exposure to the item to be learned. That is, teachers viewed learning as a presentation of details to be recalled by the students. Consequently, their classroom activities did not reflect a pattern of progression of skills in any type

of hierarchical and sequential order. Whether dealing with a specific detail or the Author's Generalization, the teacher structured the class so that the final word on the subject was his/hers. The student was expected to remember this information rather than to develop a competency for obtaining the information on his/her own.

Both the information obtained in the teacher interviews and the evaluation processes used by the teachers provided additional support for this conclusion that the teachers' underlying conceptualization of learning was based on an approach that viewed learning as a presentation of details to be recalled by students. The implication was that students would attain the competency to do what the teacher had done by observing the results -- not necessarily the processes -- of what the teacher had done.

2) Because of the teachers' conceptualization of how learning occurs, because of the teachers' perception that students were actively involved in their own learning and were successful, because the teachers saw nothing from their students' behavior in the classroom to suggest the need for rethinking their conceptualization of learning or the methods used, and because the teachers used their perceptions of student behavior as a guide for instructional activity, the teachers found no reason to reassess the teaching processes and conceptualizations being used.

What exists for teachers in this study is a closed system that does not easily allow for reflection. Teachers never feel a need to examine their instruction since the interpretation of all the information coming back to the teacher suggests that the method is working. If, as the teachers have said in the interviews, their approach has been the result predominantly of their perceptions of student classroom behavior and learning, it will take a major action by the students to alert teachers to a need for change.

Discussion

The implication from this study is that the teachers believed students learn to interpret and analyze literature from becoming acquainted with the result of the teacher's analyses of many stories. It appears that they believe that hearing a number of interpretations and analyses would enable students to perform the process independently.

In addition, there is more than just a suggestion that the teachers are not aware of the difficulties involved with certain tasks and processes. That they frequently interchanged terms of different levels of operation supports a position that they are not able to direct a process-oriented curriculum. That is, they understand what they want from the process of interpretation, they can use the process themselves, but they are not aware of the components of the process nor how to organize it for student use. Lack of familiarity with the cognitive levels and processes plus reliance on previous experience substantially reduces the deliberative time teachers spend on preparing the story for the class. Further, as all the teachers stated, this time of deliberation is spent on "recalling" what happened with the story in previous years. Thus, the cycle of preparation, classroom study, and evaluation operates on a cognitive level below the one necessary to make students independent in interpreting literature.

Finally, it would appear that, at least in this study, the teachers' low expectations for student activity and participation severely limits the students' opportunities to experiment with and make their own interpretations of literary works. With the present concern in instructional theory addressing the need for developing thinking skills among students, this study suggests that rather than being a prime source for such development, inquiry into literature at the high school level may be, in fact, impeding higher level cognitive development -- a hidden outcome of a methodology based on simple "recall" and of a practice that makes the instructor the only one,really, with "the right answers."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, Robert, & Biddle, B. Realities of Teaching: Exploration with videotape. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1970.

Barr, Rebecca, & Dreeben, Robert. Instruction in classrooms. Review of Research in Education, 1977, 5, 89-162.

Bennett, N. Teaching styles and pupil progress. London: Open Books, 1966.

Bloom, Benjamin. All our children learning. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1981.

Bloom, Benjamin. (Ed.) Taxonomy of educational objectives: The classification of education goals. Handbook 1. Cognitive domain. New York: McKay, 1956.

Bloom, Benjamin. Time and learning. American Psychologist, 1974,29, 682-688.

Brophy, Jere E. & Putnam, J. Classroom management in the early grades. In Classroom management: 78th yearbook of the national society for the study of education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979.

Carroll, J.B. A model of school learning. Teachers College Record, 1963, 64, 723-733.

Dahllof, U.S. Ability grouping, content validity, and curriculum process analysis. New York: Teachers College Press, 1971.

Flanders, N.A. Teacher influence, pupil attitudes, and achievement. Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1965.

Hillocks, George, Jr. & Ludlow, Larry. Toward a taxonomy of skills in reading and interpreting fiction. Unpublished paper. University of Chicago, 1982.

Jackson, Phillip. Life in classrooms. New York: Holt,Rinehart,Winston, 1968.

Kounin, J.S. Discipline and group management in classrooms. New York: Holt, Rinehart, Winston, 1968.

Marx, Ronald, & Peterson, Penelope. The nature of tea-her decision making. In Bruce R. Joyce, Clark C. Brown, & Lucy Peck (Eds.) Flexibility in teaching: An excursion into the nature of teaching and training. New York: Longman Publishers, 1981.

Purves, Alan, Dill, N.L., Weiss, J. & Foshay, A.W. The teaching of literature. New York: Teachers College, 1967.

Purves, Alan. The elements of writing about a literary work. Champaign, Ill: National Council of Teachers of English, 1968.

Rosenshine, Barak, & Furst, Norma. The use of direct observation to study teachers: Second handbook of research on teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1973.